

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1 and 4-11 are currently being prosecuted. Claims 23-33 have been withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider her rejections in view of the amendments as set forth below.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT**

Applicants submit that the entry of the present amendment is appropriate since the only change is to correct an objection to claim 9. Accordingly, entry is requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 4 through 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Emori et al. (WO 99/26195). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, applicants submit that the Emori et al. reference cannot properly be used in an art rejection in the present application. The publication date of the PCT application is May 27, 1999. Applicants have claimed priority to two Japanese applications having priority dates of October 30, 1998 and January 26, 1999. Both of these dates pre-date the date of the reference. Applicants have

previously submitted certified copies of these priority documents which have been acknowledged by the Examiner. Accordingly, applicants submit that this rejection is overcome since the Emori et al. reference has a date which falls after the priority date of the present application.

Furthermore, applicants submit that claim 1 is further allowable over the reference in defining the IC element and the second coil as being electrically connected and formed integrally. The Examiner states that the wired connection of second coil (8) and IC chip (6) is the same as being formed integrally. Applicants disagree that this is the case. As indicated on page 34 of the present specification, this integral formation can occur during the manufacturing stage or in the package-forming stage. This arrangement avoids the need for wires as is done in the conventional method as mentioned in the paragraph bridging page 34 and 35. For these reasons, applicants submit that Emori et al. does not teach an IC element integrally formed with the second coil and, accordingly, does not anticipate claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore considered to be allowable.

Claims 4 through 11 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. These claims each contain other features of the invention, some of which are not seen in the reference. For example, claim 9 requires that the coils be arranged on opposite surfaces of a supporting member. This is not seen in the reference. Also, claim 11 describes a third coil in the booster unit which is

not seen in Figure 3A as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, applicants submit that these claims are additionally allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patent relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, in view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Mr. Robert F. Gnuse, Registration No. 27,295 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Applicants hereby petition for a three month extension of time to December 25, 2003, within which to respond to the Office Action of June 25, 2003. The prescribed fee in the amount of \$950.00 is included in the check attached hereto.

Appl. No. 09/430,186  
Atty. Docket: 0152-0515P  
Amendment filed December 24, 2003

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Scott J. Lue #41,458

Joseph A. Kolasch, #22,463

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

*10/1* JAK:RFG/mks/ags  
152-515P